REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

I.   Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 32-34 were allowed. The Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable claims. Claims 32-34 remain unchanged, and thus, remain in condition for allowance.

Independent claim 6 and claims 7-9 that depend therefrom were identified as being allowable if amended to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection discussed below by clarifying that the method includes steps related to providing a computation unit and obtaining data using the computation unit. The Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter. Independent claim 6 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner. As a result, it is submitted that independent claim 6 and claims 7-9 that depend therefrom are in condition for allowance.

Further, independent claim 18 and claims 19-22 that depend therefrom were identified as being allowable if amended to overcome the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection discussed below by clarifying that the computation unit is programmed to perform specific operations, so as to positively recite the structures of the computation unit. The Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter. Independent claim 18 has been amended to clarify that the computation unit is "programmed to" perform specific operation. As a result, it is submitted that independent claim 18 and claims 19-22 that depend therefrom are in condition for allowance.

II.   Amendments to the Claims

Claims 1-5, 10-17, 23-31 and 35-43 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein.

As mentioned above, independent claims 6 and 18 have been amended <u>exactly</u> as suggested by the Examiner.

III.   35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph Rejection

Claims 6-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for not clearly reciting how the "obtaining data of a dialysis patient" is performed in a computation step. The Examiner kindly provided a suggestion to overcome this rejection.

As mentioned above, claim 6 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner. As a result, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection is no longer applicable and that independent claim 6 and claims 7-9 that depend therefrom are in condition for allowance.

IV.   35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 18-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Miller. The Examiner kindly provided a suggestion for overcoming this rejection. Specifically, the Examiner suggested amending claim 18 to recite that the computation unit is "programmed to …"

As mentioned above, claim 18 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner. As a result, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection is no longer applicable and that independent claim 18 and claims 19-22 that depend therefrom are in condition for allowance.

V.   Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Hiroyuki HAMADA et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/
2010.01.27 13:56:17 -05'00'

By _____

Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
January 27, 2010

The USPTO is hereby authorized to charge any fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16, 1.17, and 1.492, which may be required by this paper to Deposit Account No. 23-0975.